

Remarks

The Applicants note with appreciation that the prior rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 based on Kashiwade has been withdrawn. The Applicants also note with appreciation that Claims 22-26 and 29-31 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form.

The Applicants acknowledge the objection to Claims 27 and 28 and have accordingly corrected Claim 27 in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestion. The Applicants respectfully submit that both of Claims 27 and 28 are now also allowable if rewritten into independent form. Confirmation is respectfully requested.

With respect to the above mentioned allowability, the Applicants have amended Claim 19 to include the subject matter of allowable Claim 22. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 19 is now in condition for allowance. Confirmation is respectfully requested. Claims 22-25, all of which previously depended on any of Claims 17 to 20 have now been amended to depend from any one of Claims 17, 18 or 20.

New Claims 32-40 have been added. New Claims 32-34 simply combine the subject matter of Claim 19 (in its previously unamended state) to include the allowable subject matter of Claims 23, 24 and 25, respectively. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 32-34 are in condition for allowance.

The Applicants have also added Claims 35-40. They are the same as Claims 26-31, respectively, except that they depend either directly or indirectly from allowable new Claim 34. Confirmation of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Applicants acknowledge the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of Claims 17-20 as being anticipated by Akhtar. The Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 19 is now moot in view of the above-mentioned amendment. The Applicants note with appreciation the

Examiner's helpful and detailed comments concerning the hypothetical applicability of Akhtar to Claims 17, 18, 19 and 20. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that Akhtar fails to disclose, either explicitly or implicitly, every claimed aspect within those claims. For example, as applied to Claims 17 and 18, the Applicants note that the structure comprises 55 to 80% by volume of a polyamide resin and from 20 to 45% by volume of a PPS resin. Unfortunately, all of the Akhtar compositions contain percentages that are outside of the claimed ratio. For example, the Examiner helpfully points to the indicated blends on page 694 of Akhtar. The second full paragraph in the left hand column discloses a PPS/N66 blend of 70-30%. This is outside the claimed ratio as it applies to Claims 17 and 18. In that same paragraph in Akhtar, there is further disclosed a 50/50 blend. Again, this is outside the claimed ratio. The paragraph that spans the left and right hand column again includes a PPS/N66 ratio of 70/30%. This is outside the claimed range. Shifting now to the right hand column, there is again disclosed several 50/50 blends and several 70/30 blends. Those are all outside of the claimed range as recited in Claims 17 and 18. Similar comments apply to the disclosure on page 695. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Akhtar is not applicable to Claims 17 and 18.

With respect to Claims 20 and 21, the points are essentially the same as set forth above with respect to Claims 17 and 18 except that the upper end of the quantity of polyamide resin available is increased and the lower end of the PPS resin is decreased. Nonetheless, irrespective of the change in ranges, that does not impact the fact that the blends shown on pages 694 and 695 of Akhtar do not fall within the ranges set forth in Claims 20 and 21. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Akhtar is not applicable to either of Claims 20 or 21.

Moreover, Claim 20 specifically recites that the polyamide resin forms a continuous phase and the PPS resin forms a laminar disperse phase. The Applicants see no reference to the PPS resin

of Akhtar forming a laminar disperse phase in any location. The closest possibility is a continuous phase of polyamide resin and bundles of PPS fibers. However, that is not the same as the claimed laminar disperse phase of polyphenylene sulfide. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Akhtar is not applicable to either of Claims 20 or 21.

As a result of the above failure of Akhtar to explicitly or implicitly disclose explicitly claimed portions of Claims 17, 18, 20 and 21, the Applicant respectfully submit that Akhtar is not applicable and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of those claims.

The Applicants acknowledge the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claim 21 over the hypothetical combination of Kashiwadata with Akhtar. The Applicants respectfully submit that Kashiwadata fails to cure the deficiencies set forth above with respect to Akhtar. In other words, hypothetically combining Kashiwadata with Akhtar would still result in a thermoplastic resin structure that is different from the structure recited in Claim 1. The inorganic fillers disclosed by Kashiwadata do not change the inadequacies mentioned above with respect to Akhtar. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that even of one of ordinary skill in the art were to make the hypothetical combination, that the resulting structure would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in Claim 21. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application in condition for allowance. Entry of the above amendments and new claims into the official file is respectfully requested inasmuch as the Applicants believe that the above amendments and new claims reduce the issues for appeal, overcome all of the rejections and, in fact, place the Application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC:rb
(215) 656-3381